

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	D. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/715,989 11/18/2003		11/18/2003	Stephane Bedard	TJK/432	TJK/432 4888	
27717	7590	07/14/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP				MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H		
55 E. MONROE STREET						
SUITE 4200				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803				3738		

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summer	10/715,989	BEDARD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	William H. Matthews (Howie)	3738					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 A</u>	oril 2006						
· 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4,5,7,8,10-15 and 22-24</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6 and 16-21</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	'						
1	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	,, ,					

Application/Control Number: 10/715,989 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

Tim Keefer on 12-8-04.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 22-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR
 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the telephonic conversation with

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 4-17-06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to Christensen, Applicant contends Christensen lacks the sensor being the only element interposed between the top part of the elongated body and the connector. Examiner believes Christensen meets this limitation because the pivot part is described as optional.
- 3. With regard to arguments pertaining to Allen and the 103(a) rejections, these rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-3,6,16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

Application/Control Number: 10/715,989 Page 3

Art Unit: 3738

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites "wherein in operation the at least one sensor is the only element interposed between the connector and the top part of the elongated body". Figures 10-11 show multiple elements disposed between the top part and connector. Furthermore, the specification does not describe this limitation. In addition, claim 19 recites the sensors being "generally biased" while the specification supports "slightly biased".

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 20 recites using an "optical interface" which was not clearly described in the specification. It is unclear with which technology "optical" refers to, i.e infrared light, fiber optic cables, or other devices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 3738

2. Claims 1-3,6,18,19,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christensen US PUB 2003/012353.

Christensen discloses in figure 9 and paragraphs 53-58 an instrumented prosthetic foot comprising connector 250, elongated body 200 having top and bottom portions, ground engaging areas for heel 246 and toe 238, and at least one sensor or load cell 254 interfaced with a controller.

Note, the limitation "only element" of claim 1 is not clearly described in the specification to define what constitutes an "element". Furthermore, figure 9b shows at least one sensor 260 as the only element between top part of elongated body 266 and connector part 264, and pivot 270 is described as an optional part.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 16,17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen US PUB 2003/0120353 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tarjan et al. US PN 6,091,977.

Christensen meets the structural limitations of claims 16, 17 and 20 but lacks the express written disclosure of using a wired, wireless, or optical interface to connect the sensor and controller. Tarjan et al. teach control systems for prosthetic parts having

Page 5

sensors wherein the interface may be made by wireless, wired, or optical interfaces (c1:10-15 and c5:57-c6:44) in order to transmit data to the controller.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prosthesis disclosed by Christensen to include a wireless, wired, or optical interface as taught by Tarjan et al. in order to transmit data to the controller.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number

Application/Control Number: 10/715,989 Page 6

Art Unit: 3738

is 571-272-4753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William H Matthews

July 7, 2006

CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700